

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY AUGUST 7, 2006

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 25, 2006

AMENDED IN SENATE JANUARY 11, 2006

AMENDED IN SENATE AUGUST 22, 2005

AMENDED IN SENATE AUGUST 16, 2005

AMENDED IN SENATE JULY 14, 2005

AMENDED IN SENATE APRIL 25, 2005

AMENDED IN SENATE APRIL 4, 2005

SENATE BILL

No. 767

**Introduced by Senator Romero
(Coauthor: Senator Torlakson)**

February 22, 2005

An act relating to school district governance.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 767, as amended, Romero. School district governance: study and report.

Existing law provides for the establishment, governance, organization, and reorganization of school districts.

This bill would require the California Research Bureau of the State Library to study and examine specified school districts during a certain timeframe and to submit a report to the Legislature on or before October 1, 2007, regarding the bureau's review of specified areas for each of those school districts, including, among others, the structure of school district governance in each district.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes.
State-mandated local program: no.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

1 SECTION 1. (a) The California Research Bureau of the State
2 Library shall study and examine the school districts specified in
3 subdivision (b) during a 10-year timeframe starting in 1995 and
4 ending in 2005, unless otherwise indicated, and shall submit a
5 report to the Legislature on or before October 1, 2007, that
6 includes all of the following:

7 (1) Review of the structure of school district governance in
8 each district and provide a history of any change in school
9 district governance over the past 10 years, including conditions
10 that lead to these changes. This structural examination shall
11 include the authority and accountability of, as appropriate, the
12 district superintendent, elected school board, mayor, mayor
13 appointed school board, and schools.

14 (2) Review of growth in pupil achievement. For each district,
15 the study shall do the following:

16 (A) Provide pupil demographic information, including
17 enrollment, race and ethnicity, English language learners, pupils
18 eligible for free and reduced price lunch meals, and transience
19 rates over time.

20 (B) Analyze pupil achievement data in each district, including
21 regular and charter schools, using each respective state's
22 standardized achievement tests and high school graduation rates.
23 In this respect, the study shall do the following:

24 (i) Identify and compare the components of the state
25 accountability systems in the states where the districts are
26 located, including comparison of academic standards and the
27 measurement of achievement.

28 (ii) Analyze district changes in achievement over time (10
29 years when available) post adoption of a state accountability
30 system.

31 (iii) Identify the changes in academic achievement over time
32 of subgroups of pupils disaggregated by race, ethnicity, and
33 English language learners.

34 (iv) Identify the achievement gaps between subgroups of
35 pupils in the districts over time.

(C) Compare strategies and programs utilized in each district in their efforts to improve pupil achievement. In this respect, the study shall do the following:

(i) Identify significant school improvement initiatives that directly resulted in increased pupil achievement, such as school counselors, college preparatory courses, and career technical courses.

(ii) Identify who directed the effort.

(iii) Identify how long it took for achievement gains to occur.

(iv) Identify the cost per pupil for these initiatives.

(3) Review the funding structure of each district, including the following:

(A) The authority, responsibility, and ability of the respective states, counties, cities, and mayors to provide funding for school districts.

(B) The funding mechanism, revenue sources, and per pupil expenditures.

(C) Specific funding mechanisms in mayoral control districts that could be used to increase financial support for nonmayoral control districts.

(D) Specify any ongoing private contributions to all schools, including charter schools, in each district.

(4) Identification of specific changes in certificated and classified collective bargaining agreements related to school improvement during the 10-year timeframe or before and after any changes in school district governance.

(5) Review of classroom and school infrastructure of each district, to include all of the following:

(A) The physical condition of schools and the costs of improvements made during the timeframe, including the extent of overcrowding, and the number, if any, of portable classrooms onsite.

(B) Pending school facilities projects and timeframe for completion.

(C) The history and investment in infrastructure and facilities improvements in each district.

(D) The number of school instructional days and the structure of the school calendar, such as traditional schedule or multitrack schedule.

(b) The school districts to be studied and examined for purposes of the report specified in subdivision (a) shall be all of the following, which includes the state of location:

- (1) Baltimore City Public School System, Maryland.
- (2) Boston Public Schools, Massachusetts.
- (3) *Boston University/Chelsea Partnership, Massachusetts.*
- ~~(3)~~
- (4) Broward County Public Schools, Florida.
- ~~(4)~~
- (5) Chicago Public Schools, Illinois.
- ~~(5)~~
- (6) Cleveland Municipal School District, Ohio.
- ~~(6)~~
- (7) Detroit Public Schools, Michigan.
- ~~(7)~~
- (8) Garden Grove Unified School District, California.
- ~~(8)~~
- (9) Houston Independent School District, Texas.
- ~~(9)~~
- (10) Long Beach Unified School District, California.
- ~~(10)~~
- (11) Los Angeles Unified School District, California.
- ~~(11)~~
- (12) New York City Schools, New York.
- ~~(12)~~
- (13) Seattle Public Schools, Washington.